REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-24 stand in this application. Claims 6, 7 and 10 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 in order to facilitate prosecution on the merits. Support for the above amendments can be found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0023] - [0025].

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,313,838 B1 to Deering (hereinafter "Deering") in view of United States Publication No. 2003/0233592 A1 to Lin et al. (hereinafter "Lin") in view of United States Patent No. 7,256,788 B1 A1 to Luu et al. (hereinafter "Luu") in view of United States Publication No. 2004/0175598 A1 to Bliven et al. (hereinafter "Bliven"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element recited in claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-24. Therefore claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-24 define over the cited references whether taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite the following language, in relevant part:

> wherein a clock speed of the first processor is repeatedly set while
> the first processor is performing a sequence of graphics tasks such
> that an actual deadline margin approaches zero.

According to the Office Action, the missing language is disclosed by Luu. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Luu fails to disclose the missing language of the claimed subject matter. For example, the Office Action states at least on pages 4-5 that Luu

Appl. No. 10/814,425
Response Dated July 28, 2009
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2009

Docket No.: P18586/1020P18586
Examiner: Ji H. Bae
TC/A.U. 2115

teaches that power savings may be achieved by putting the CPU (which is simply waiting for acknowledgement from the graphics processor that it is ready for additional commands) into a power savings mode. Applicant submits that this is different than the above recited language of amended independent claim 1.

Applicant submits that merely putting the CPU into a power savings mode, as arguably taught by Luu, is different than repeatedly setting a clock speed for the processor as recited in claim 1. Additionally, the CPU of Luu is placed into a power savings mode while the CPU is inactive and while waiting for response from the graphics processor. In contrast, the language of claim 1 recites that the clock speed of the first processor is repeatedly set while the first processor is performing a sequence of graphics tasks. Furthermore, Applicant submits that they have been unable to locate any teaching in Luu directed to repeatedly setting the clock speed of a processor such that an actual deadline margin approaches zero as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Applicant submits that they have been unable to locate at least the above recited language of amended independent claim 1 in the teaching of Luu. Therefore, the Luu fails to disclose, teach or suggest the missing language. Furthermore, Applicant submits that they have also been unable to locate at least the above recited language in the teaching of Deering, Lin or Bliven. Consequently, the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every element recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination. In addition, claims 8, 14 and 21 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 14 and 21 are not obvious and are patentable over the cited references for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 1, 8, 14 and 21.

Furthermore, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See* MPEP § 2143.03, for example. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims

Appl. No. 10/814,425
Response Dated July 28, 2009
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2009

Docket No.: P18586/1020P18586
Examiner: Ji H. Bae
TC/A.U. 2115

2-5, 9-13, 15-20 and 22-24 that depend from claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 respectively, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-24 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the limitations of the independent claims and dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the independent or dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,
KACVINSKY LLC

/Andrew H. Aurand/

Andrew H. Aurand, Reg. No. 61,875
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: July 28, 2009

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O CPA Global
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(724) 933-5529